THE C. H. DOUGLAS CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

BATTLE IS JOINED!

Douglas Social Credit assumes that Society is primarily meta-physical, and must have regard to the Organic relationships of its Prototype.

In this special anniversary issue celebrating the birth of C. H. Douglas we take you back to 1938 and an exemplary appraisal of the nature of Man in relation to the Nation State. Here Douglas, with his masterly technique of presenting complex ideas in easy to understand and follow aphorisms in an address which is as relevant today as it was 85 years ago, as the plight of the downtrodden native English, Scottish, Welsh and Irish with their cultural inheritance robbed from right under their very noses ensuring that their irreplace-able heritage, traditions, and institutions are all now but gone. Against this backdrop of High Treason the further humiliation of the native Is-lander has ensured that the key posts of State are now filled by Aliens, all of which Douglas, to his eternal "credit" and of course to the best of his abilities prophesied would happen if no action were taken.

Beginning with a simple but effective Group A, and Group B dia-gram breakdown Douglas presents the main body of ideas in so-cial and political organisation that appraised the modern world as it was back then, and, as far as the organic Islander's cultural inher-itance is concerned today. . . "If any would be greatest among you let him be your servant," is of more relevance now.

In considering what I should say to you tonight, it appeared to me to be more useful to deal with certain broad and general problems which confront us all, rather than to take up your time with technical matters of finance or otherwise, since it is the so- called axioms of our civilisation which are challenged and require examination rather than the details.

There is a peculiar fitness in talking about these things to you who live under, and are inevitably influenced by, the force of a great tradition. Tradition has a hypnotic effect and crystallises in institutions.

It is with full consciousness of this that I can make to you at once, in a few words, and count upon you to understand at once, the most important statement I have to offer: that *the future of civilisation hangs on a reversal of the present domination of individuals by institutions.*

To those who are not familiar with (and therefore do not venerate, as I do myself, and as no doubt do you) the force and value of tradition, this statement might, on first hearing, sound like an attack upon tradition, and the institutions whiçh embody it. I Nothing could be further from my mean ing. Tradition, with its institutions, when they have survived through the centuries, represents an invaluable body of experience.

But it is most important, I think, to bear in mind that human social experience is in general relative to particular economic and political systems, and there comes a time, such as the present, when the experience we have gained has to be employed with great judgment or it may be a hindrance, rather than a help. But

if it is so employed, nothing, in my opinion, can replace it.

Now, I think that in the world today there are two quite fundamental ideas which are struggling for acceptance. They are capable of various antitheses, and I have made two groups of some of these—not necessarily or probably comprehensive, which might per haps be called Group A and Group B:

Group A.		Group B.
Deductive	*v.*	*Inductive*
Totalitarian	„	*Democratic*
Machiavellian	„	*Baconian*
Idealistic	„	*Realistic*
Jewish	„	*Christian*
Love of Power	„	*Love of Freedom*
Planned Economy	„	*Organic Growth*

Group A comprises, on the whole, those habits of mind which are effective in affairs and particularly, affairs of State, today.

With some hesitation, I will suggest that they may have been the more pragmatically useful group in the past. I have no hesitation in saying that the persistence of these habits of mind in our present world, threatens that world with general catastrophe.

The flowers of the Group A ideas are the modern Dictatorships. I should like you, for a moment, to consider the fact that Messrs. Stalin, Mussolini and Hitler, to mention the better known, are men of what Jane Austen would have called "humble" birth.

I won't waste time by protesting that there is nothing derogatory in this statement—it merely means that, *per se,* it is a start in life which seems, from our point of view, to limit the opportunities of experience, and consequently it tends to produce what is nowadays called an "inferiority complex." "Humble birth" is, of course, a feature of a particular social system.

I do not think that this similarity in origin of the Dictators is accidental. Neither, am I convinced that their meteoric rise is a compliment to their useful qualities as members of society. Rather I am inclined to regard it as a damning indictment of the systems for which they stand, as being the embodiment of the "inferiority complex." You will no doubt feel that this statement requires some amplification.

There is, I believe, little difference of opinion among psychologists that the characteristics of Group A are all characteristics of immaturity, of what we should call a genuine deficiency of education and culture.

So is an "inferiority complex." The unfortunate victim of it yearns to inflict on others the slights, and real or fancied injustices, he has, or thinks he has, himself, suffered. A dictatorship is a grim confirmation of the prophecy 'The last shall be first."

The first characteristic of a dictatorship is the assumption that all wisdom in regard to the objects of the State is centred in the Dictator. Logically, if things go wrong, it is the fault, not of the policy, but of individuals who are entrusted with its execution. Hence we arrive by rapid stages at what is so charmingly called "**the blood purge"**

The second characteristic is the exaltation of abstractions, such as the State. The first article of the Italian Constitution, for instance, is that the State is everything, the individual nothing except as he is of service to the State. This is typical of Group A thinking.

You no doubt remember ***Punch's*** story of the cross-channel passenger in the saloon to whom the steward said, "You can't be sick here, sir," and the passenger's reply, "Can't I?" as he demonstrated that he could.

The steward's rebuke was Group A thinking, and the passenger's reply, Group B thinking. The steward's insistence on tradition was right in its

way, but he mistook tradition for natural law, which is a fatal mistake.

Great Britain, although not a titular dictatorship, is an oligarchy moving towards a dictatorship as a result of the elevation of financial and legal conventions easily recognisable as belonging to Group A.

I see no reason to assume that, making allowance for the character of the people, the outcome will be less deplorable than is the case, say, in Russia, although it may take an immediately less murderous form.

One immediate effect of it is that on the whole British Statesmen do not represent the best talent available, partly because the best talent available is repelled by current political practices.

That marvellous pioneer, Francis Bacon, Earl of Verulam, in the ***Novum Organum,*** saw the nature of the problem clearly, and stated it with precision. He said in effect, "We can proceed no further along the lines of thought now prevalent. What is required is a just, that is to say, a realistic, relationship, between the mind and things."

The scientists took his advice, and modern mastery of nature is the result. The lawyers and financiers did not, and civilisation is breaking up because they did not. Nations are striving for things which are no use to them, and suffering under necessities which have no real existence.

Instead, then, of endeavouring to impose some abstract and immature organisation upon nations and upon the world, the first step would appear to be to examine the nature of nations. The first fact which seems incontestable about nations is that they are collections of human beings.

Human beings can exist quite comfortably without nations, but nations, or States, cannot exist without human beings. That would appear to settle once and for all the question of the relative importance of human beings and nations.

But it is a fact that human beings do tend to form nations. Why? The answer is, I think, quite simple. Human beings associate together originally ***in order that each individual may benefit by association.*** The simplest example is pulling on a rope.

Men don't pull on a rope for the benefit of the rope; they provide the rope for the benefit their associated effort brings to each of them.

Now there is definitely a form of Government which is associated with this conception—genuine Democracy, No one takes seriously the verbiage prevalent about the struggle between Democratic and Totalitarian Governments — there ***are no*** Democratic Governments.

But there might be perhaps I might be permitted to touch on a few of the things that Democracy is not.

While it is inconsistent with arbitrary special privilege, economic or otherwise, it does not mean equalitarianism. It would be just as sensible to say, without amplification, that everyone had a right to a place in the Eleven.

So they have, if they have the qualifications, and it is recognised that the number of places is by general consent limited.

Neither does democracy mean a referendum or an election on every detail of day-to- day national management. On the contrary, a realistic conception of democracy insists that a community is sovereign, but it is not technical.

It has a right to demand results but not to dictate methods, the word "right" being used in the pragmatic sense.

But if the results desired are not being obtained it has a right to an explanation and, if necessary, the replacement of its administrators.

So far as Great Britain is concerned, I am inclined to think that the divergence from Democracy is not difficult to indicate. Easily the most glaring feature is our money and credit system, which is indefensible.

The information it affords us is illusory, and no security is possible until it is drastically modified.

The Parliamentary System has been perverted to purposes for which it was not intended, and all real power has been taken from it by the Cabinet.

Finally, our legal system has been exalted to a semi-divine omnipotence, and invested with sanctions which make it a Master and not a Servant.

Obviously it would take much too long to examine each of these aspects of our decadence at length.

I do not believe that any of them will really be put right until there is a much wider consciousness of the natural relationship between the individual and his institutions.

If that can be obtained, and not until it is obtained, we shall dispense with a type of statesman who, in spite of Abraham Lincoln's warning, still hopefully tries to fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all the time, and, instead, obtain men who recognise that the advice, If any would be greatest among you let him be your servant," was not sentimentalism, but a brilliant maxim of social and political organisation.

Short Address given to a Society in a Great School, March 9, 1938.